

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 19-26 are pending in the present application. Claims 19-26 have been rejected. Claims 19, 20 and 22 are amended by this Amendment. Support for this Amendment is found generally throughout the specification and figures. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, Claims 19-26 remain pending in the present application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the amendments to the claims and the following remarks.

INTERVIEW

Applicants would like to thank Examiner Brier for the phone interview of April 27, 2009. We appreciate the courtesy and helpfulness of the Examiner in the interview. The claims have been amended in light of the points made by the Examiner in the interview.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112, 1st Paragraph

Claims 19-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

As to Claims 19-21 and 22-26:

Applicant submits Independent Claims 19 and 22 have been amended to overcome the rejection, including use of the term “glyph server” in conjunction with “single computer system.” Therefore, Applicant believes the rejection is overcome.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd Paragraph

Claims 19-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 19 – The claim is unclear as to which element is performing the method:

Applicant submits line 2, Claim 19 has been amended to recite “glyph cache unit” instead of “single computer system.” Therefore, Applicant believes the rejection is overcome because it is now clear that the glyph server is performing the method.

Claim 19, Line 4 – it is unclear which element receives a request because “software client” is claimed:

Applicant submits line 4, Claim 19 has been amended to recite “the glyph cache unit” instead of “at least one software client.” Therefore, Applicant believes the rejection is overcome because it is now clear that the glyph server is receiving the request.

Claim 19, Line 8 – It is unclear which element is “the single computer system”:

Applicant submits line 8, Claim 19 has been amended to recite “graphics system” instead of “single computer system.” Therefore, Applicant believes the rejection is overcome because it is now clear that the glyph cache unit is in communication with the graphics system.

Claim 19, Line 12 – it is unclear which element is receiving the glyph data descriptions:

Applicant respectfully submits that the claim as written, clearly indicates that the line layout core module 12 has 2 claimed features: 1) receiving the glyph codes; and 2) determining the glyph data descriptions.

Claim 19, Line 16 – the data shared is unclear:

Applicant respectfully submits Claim 19, Line 13 was amended to recite, “glyph cache unit, wherein the glyph cache unit handles multiple requests at a time.” Therefore, Applicant believes the rejection is overcome because it is now clear that because the glyph cache unit handles multiple request at a time, the glyph construction time is thereby decreased.

Claim 20, Lines 2-3 – open font architecture module lacks antecedent basis and there appear to be missing claim limitations:

Applicant respectfully submits Claim 20, Lines 2-3 were amended to recite, “...architecture module services unit in at least one scaler unit in and interpreting font data with a font file.”

Therefore, Applicant believes the rejection is overcome.

Claim 22, Line 10 – open font architecture unit lacks antecedent basis:

Applicant respectfully submits Claim 22, Line 9 was amended to recite “open font architecture services unit” and Line Claim 22, Line 10 was amended to recite “open font architecture services unit.” Therefore, “open font architecture services unit” now has proper antecedent basis since both lines match exactly.

Claim 22, Line 14 – open font architecture and font scaler unit both lack antecedent basis:

Applicant respectfully submits “open font architecture services unit” now has proper antecedent basis because of the amendment made in Line 9 (described above). Applicant further submits “font scaler unit” now has proper antecedent basis because of the amendment made in Line 10 (described above). Therefore, Applicant believes both rejections are overcome.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all pending Claims 19-26 as they are newly amended and presented. Applicants' attorney believes this application is in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

June 11, 2009

/Renee R. Reid/
Renee Rea Reid
Reg. No. 52,159

Customer Number 62736

(650) 493-4540

(650) 493-4549